

U.S. Serial No. 09/746,325
Page 5

REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action mailed on January 13, 2005, and in conjunction with the concurrently filed Request for Continued Examination, a copy of which is attached, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 9, 16 and 20 have been amended. No new matter has been entered. The amendments to the claims are fully supported in the specification, see for example pages 4 and 5 of the specification.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Microsoft Passport in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,966,705 issued to Koneru et al. (hereinafter "Koneru").

For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art; that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or combined references; and that the proposed modification of the prior art must have had a reasonable expectation of success, determined from the vantage point of the skilled artisan at the time the invention was made. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In Re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970).

This rejection is respectfully traversed because Microsoft Passport in view of Koneru does not teach or suggest all of the elements in Claims 1-20.

Claim 1 recites a method for providing information on a plurality of users to a plurality of requestors over the Internet. The method comprises: storing information on the plurality of users in a database located on a cookie management system and associating the information with a plurality of keys, receiving a request at the cookie management system for information on a particular user from a requestor over the Internet; receiving a key associated with the request

36968/248469

U.S. Serial No. 09/746,325

Page 6

at the cookie management system from the requestor over the Internet, the key associated with the request included in a cookie on a machine of the particular user, wherein the key associated with the request was retrieved from the machine of the particular user by the requestor and the machine of the particular user does not have access to the cookie management system; using the key associated with the request to retrieve the information on the particular user from the database; and forwarding the information on the particular user to the requestor over the Internet.

Applicant submits that Microsoft Passport in view of Koneru does not teach or suggest at least the elements "storing information on the plurality of users in a database located on a cookie management system and associating the information with a plurality of keys; receiving a request at the cookie management system ... from a requestor ... and receiving a key associated with the request at the cookie management system from the requestor ... the key associated with the request included in a cookie on a machine of the particular user ... the key associated with the request was retrieved from the machine of the particular user by the requestor and the machine of the particular user does not have access to the cookie management system" as recited in Claim 1.

In contrast, Microsoft Passport teaches collecting customization information for an end-user and storing it in a central location. Microsoft Passport also teaches that there is direct communication (access) between the passport server (cookie management system) and the end-user machine (machine of the particular user). Microsoft Passport does not teach that "the machine of the particular user does not have access to the cookie management system" as recited in Claim 1. The addition of the teaching of Koneru does not cure this deficiency. Koneru teaches a user system with a cookie accessing a website that contains customization information associated with the user. Koneru is directed to allowing a server to have a single copy of a customization database that may be shared between secure and non-secure areas of the website. There is direct communication (access) between the website with the customization information (cookie management system) and the user machine (machine of the particular user). Therefore, neither Microsoft Passport nor Koneru combined or individually teach all of the elements of Claim 1. Specifically, Microsoft Passport in view of Koneru does not teach that "the machine of the particular user does not have access to the cookie management system" as recited in Claim 1. For at least this reason, Claim 1 is patentable over Microsoft Passport in view of Koneru.

36968/248469

U.S. Serial No. 09/746,325

Page 7

Because they depend from Claim 1, Claims 2-8 and 14 are also patentable over Microsoft Passport in view of Koneru.


Claims 9 recites the element "the user's machine does not have access to the cookie management system" and Claim 16 recites the element "the machine of the particular user does not have access to the cookie management system." Because Claims 9 and 16 include elements that are similar to Claim 1, Claims 9 and 16 are patentable over Microsoft Passport in view of Koneru for at least the same reasons that Claim 1 is patentable over Microsoft Passport in view of Koneru. Because they depend from Claim 9, Claims 10-13 and 15 are patentable over Microsoft Passport in view of Koneru for at least the same reasons advanced with respect to Claim 9. Because they depend from Claim 16, Claims 17-10 are patentable over Microsoft Passport in view of Koneru for at least the same reasons advanced with respect to Claim 16.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Applicant submits that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

If there are any charges with respect to this response or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account 06-1130 maintained by Applicants' attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Anne Davis Barry
Registration No. 47,408
Customer No. 36192

Date: April 12, 2005
Address: 55 Griffin Road South, Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone: (860) 286-2929

36968/248469